

From: Stephen Corner [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: 06 June 2018 23:59
To: NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254 - Draft Stopping-Up Order, Princes Parade, Hythe, Kent - OBJECTION

Dear National Transport Casework Team

Further to my email below of a few minutes ago, I should just add that FHDC's reason for the Stopping-Up application is also simply not necessary as the new housing and leisure centre could be served by the existing road without the need of the diversion being proposed.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Corner
████████████████████
██████████
██████████
██████████

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stephen Corner <████████████████████>
Date: 6 June 2018 at 23:42:32 BST
To: "nationalcasework@dft.gsi.gov.uk" <nationalcasework@dft.gsi.gov.uk>
Subject: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254 - Draft Stopping-Up Order, Princes Parade, Hythe, Kent - OBJECTION

Dear National Transport Casework Team

Ref: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254
Draft STOPPING-Up Order PRINCES PARADE, HTYHE, KENT

I wish to lodge my **objection** to the proposed Stopping-Up Order for Princes Parade. The ramifications arising from the movement of the road have not been considered properly or fully by Folkestone and Hythe District Council in its desire to push through a development application for the site. My reasons for objection are as follows:

1. The Royal Military Canal (RMC). The road is planned to be diverted to run inland in very close proximity to the Royal Military Canal, a scheduled ancient monument. The road will require substantial foundations and retaining walls which are likely to loom high over the canal. It will cause harm (as defined in the NPPF) to this nationally important and historically significant site. The road will also negatively impact the natural environment running alongside the canal and the wildlife it supports. There is also the potential risk and environmental issue of water run-off from the road running into the RMC.

A public foot path runs along the south side of the canal which is currently a pleasant, peaceful and tranquil area where wildlife on and around the canal may be observed and appreciated. The path is used extensively by local residents and visitors alike. This setting will be destroyed by the diversion of the road especially once the development is complete as there will be much more traffic using the road than there is now at all hours of the day. There will be increased car journeys as a result of the 150 homes and the leisure centre, there will be significantly higher volumes of heavy vehicles using the road than compared to now to provide deliveries to the commercial premises and the leisure

centre plus there will be coaches taking users to the leisure centre. The impact of this increased volume (especially of heavy vehicles) has not been sufficiently considered by FHDC. The added noise and light pollution will also affect the setting of the canal, has the potential to negatively impact wildlife and indeed may even cause a nuisance to residents on the other side of the canal.

In addition to the public foot path running alongside the canal there is a footpath (approximately in the centre of the proposed development) that runs north to south from Seabrook Road, across a bridge over the canal and on to Princes Parade. Presently this enables local residents and visitors to walk from Seabrook Road to the Canal and then on up to the seafront and is a very well used route. The new road will dissect this footpath in half and greatly affect access along this route, possibly posing a safety risk (especially with higher traffic volumes than now).

2. Road Safety – the proposals change the current straight line of the road with excellent distance visibility to a road with 6 sharp bends that inevitably substantially reduces visibility for both vehicle drivers and for pedestrians attempting to cross it (with the added risks of higher traffic volumes than now). This makes no sense. The parking that is being proposed for the new road layout is (as far as I can tell from the plans) all situated on the north side of the road which means that to access the seafront the road will have to be crossed by everyone using the car parking. This presents a much higher level of risk than now as currently parking is on the south side of the road from which the seafront can be accessed directly without the need to cross the road. Indeed it should be noted that this year FHDC installed parking meters along Princes Parade on the north side of the road which meant people parking cars had to cross the road to get to the meters. A few weeks after installation FHDC had to remove the meters and place them on the south side of the road owing to the safety concerns of forcing people to cross the road. Yet with the plans for the diverted road it will force all passengers in vehicles to cross the road (not just one person to put money in the meter) but potentially young children, elderly and disabled all having to cross the road for access to the seafront. In places people will also have to walk through the residential parts of the development to reach the seafront which is of course much less convenient than now.

3. Loss of amenity – the current direct adjacent access from the road to the seafront means that this is an attraction for both local residents and for visitors from further afield. Sea anglers, surfers and people with beach equipment such as wind breaks and BBQs etc. will lose the ability to park directly alongside the seafront and only have a very short distance to carry their equipment. The diversion of the road means the amenity of direct adjacent access is at best much more restricted and inconvenient and at worst is lost entirely.

It is also unclear whether the new public parking arrangements will be sufficient in size to replace the current volume of parking available on Princes Parade that will be lost, especially when you factor in the parking requirements of the new householders and their visitors and the parking for customers of the new commercial premises proposed for the development site.

4. Current use – Princes Parade is a widely used alternative route between Hythe and Sandgate. It helps to alleviate the congestion on the main A259 running through Seabrook. At the moment traffic is held up in several places along the A259 in Seabrook owing to narrow carriageways and on road parking. The A259 is a major bus route in both directions and both the A259 and Princes Parade are frequently used as an ambulance route from Folkestone to Hythe. Princes Parade serves as a diversion route in the event of emergency closure of the A259 or in the event of road works (as has recently been the case). The stopping up and diversion of Princes Parade (with the six sharp bends) is likely to restrict and inhibit the use of the road and potentially cause even more congestion on the A259 – especially if parking will be more limited and push more vehicle parking onto the A259 in Seabrook and Sandgate.

5. Reason not justified – my understanding of FHDC's reasons for applying for the Stopping-up of Princes Parade is so it can relocate it to the rear of the site to generate a vehicle free link from the proposed leisure centre and housing development to the promenade and beach. This reason appears to be for the benefit of the users of the leisure centre and the occupiers of the houses only and completely disregards the huge numbers of people who value and use Princes Parade now and who

will lose the amenity of the road and parking being directly adjacent to the seafront, will lose the tranquillity and setting of the Royal Military Canal, will lose access or suffer restriction to public footpaths and will end up with a road that is significantly less safe than now because of the diversion. It is also questionable why there needs to be a vehicle free link from the leisure centre to the beach. What benefit does that realistically offer? Presumably people will visit the leisure centre to use its facilities not because you can get to the beach (which they can do at present).

To my mind the reasons offered by FHDC for stopping up and diverting the road have not be justified at all, are extremely limited in benefit for the wider public and does not outweigh the very negative impacts of the application.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Corner

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10